AT you

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond ction of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. **Application Number** 10/692.622 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date October 24, 2003 First Named Inventor **FORM** Jerome O. Vogedes Art Unit 2686 Examiner Name Suhail Khan (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 33692.03.3156 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC 1 Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final **Provisional Application** Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer **Extension of Time Request** below): -return postcard Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s)\_ Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. Signature Printed name Christopher J. Reckamp Date Reg. No. December 6, 2005 34,414 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Christine A. Wright

Typed or printed name

Date

December 6, 2005

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Jerome O. Vogedes, et al.

Examiner: Suhail Khan

Serial No. 10/692,622

Art Group: 2686

Filing Date: October 24, 2003

Docket No.: 33692.03.3156

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR SENDER CONTROLLABLE

**MODALITIES** 

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope
addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 223 18-1450, on this date.

Date

Christine A. Wright

## **AFTER FINAL RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 6, 2005, for the above-identified patent application, Applicants respond as follows:

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-21 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Application No. 2004/0198471 (Deeds). It appears that the Deeds reference and its teachings have apparently been misapprehended in view of the claimed subject matter. The sender in Deeds has no control of the modality of the receiving unit nor does any sender send priority commands that include the modality alert command. In claim 1, for example, the sender (e.g. the originating unit) directs the modality change in the receiving unit. In Deeds, the recipient unit controls the ring tone to Morse code translation. Moreover, the office action does not